



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,590	09/15/2003	Shunsuke Nagatani	117146	8069
25944 7590 08/28/2009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
MOTSINGER, SEAN T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2624				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/28/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/661,590

Applicant(s)

NAGATANI ET AL.

Examiner

SEAN MOTSINGER

Art Unit

2624

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1.4.6 and 9-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1.4.6, 9-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Applicants Arguments/Amendments

Applicants arguments/amendments filed on 5/27/2009 have been entered and made of record

Applicants arguments with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 first and second paragraph have been fully considered but are not persuasive. As explained in the interview the elements cited applicant both refer to aspects of the "retrieval unit" (see paragraph 47) and have nothing to do with any "second extraction unit" which is not recited in the specification. Note even in claim 1 the retrieval unit is described as capable of searching either the extracted character strings or the voice index data. In fact the "second extraction unit" appears to be no more than attempting to claim function of the retrieval unit a second time "the retrieval unit retrieving at least one of the meta data and the voice index data that include the input keyword". The cited features show exactly this retrieval based on either extracted data or voice index data. Note the elements 12 and 14 not found in areas of the specification describing the extraction unit of which there is only one.

Applicants arguments with respect to the rejections based on prior art have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicants arguments are difficult to address since there is no "second extraction" merely multiple ways options for searching in the retrieval unit (searching voice index data and searching extracted text from the slide images) and applicants arguments have confused this issue. As described in the

rejection; Chen discloses retrieval based on the text of the slides, Merrill discloses retrieval based on the text of the slides and retrieval based on associated voice index data, made possible on the same screen by use of a drop down window (column 10 lines 30-50 voice transcript, slide transcript see also figure 9).

Applicants arguments with respect to 35 U.S.C. 101 have been fully considered and the examiner has decided to withdraw the rejections. The specifications indicates that the apparatus may be implemented by a computer running and therefore meets the requirements of 101. Claim 4 now claims a processor performing a method

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application

was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no support in the specification for "a second extraction", or the element "a first extraction performed by the first extraction unit and a second extraction performed by the second extraction unit..."

Claim 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the processor, the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for every conceivable processor for performing the method. The claim which covers every conceivable means for achieving the stated method is nonenabling for the scope of the claim because the specification disclosed at most only those means known to the inventor.

Claim 1, 4, 6, and 9-11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The newly amended portions "a second extraction....." and "a first extraction performed....." make no sense in the context of the specification. Applicant seems to be confusing the extraction and retrieval functions of the specification the examiner notes that extraction is only described with respect the text data. Retrieval matches keyword data to either voice index data, or extracted text

data to identify and retrieve the data. Furthermore it is not clear what applicant means by "a same screen". Art has been applied to the claims to the best extent possible given the unclear claims.

Re claim 4, claim 4 is not an apparatus claim but contains no structural elements only method steps. There is nothing in the claim to suggest the structure of the processor.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,249,281 issued to Chen et al. ("Chen") in view of Merrill et al US 6,789,228.

For claim 1, Chen discloses an input unit that accepts an input keyword (see figure 8 keyword search field 820).

Chen discloses a storage unit that stores static image data which are associated with time positions in a video data, the static image data being displayed with the video during time positions with which the static image data are associated (see figure 8 the

retrieved static image data is displayed as a static image, and the static image data is displayed at a given reproduction time position associated with the video data when the user selects the static image, such as the beginning of the presentation for example. (See also column 5 line 57 through column 6 line 32 and figure 5).

Chen discloses a video display unit for displaying the retrieved static image data as a static image (see figure 8 the retrieved static image data is displayed as a static image); and according to user's operation for selecting the displayed static image, reproducing and displaying video data as an image from a reproduction time position with which the static image data is associated (the video data is displayed at a given reproduction time position associated with the static image data when the user selects the static image, such as the beginning of the presentation for example. See also figure 5 and column 5 line 57 through column 6 line 32).

Chen discloses an extraction unit that extracts a character string contained in static image data and a retrieval unit that matches the extracted character string with the input keyword to retrieve relevant static image data (see figure 8 the keyword is input to the keyword search field 820 and static image data with extracted character strings that match the keyword are retrieved).

Chen does not explicitly disclose extracts a character string contained in static image data by at least one of (1) extracting text data from the static image data which has the text data, and (2) performing character recognition processing on the static image data and extracting text data which is a result of the processing.

Merril discloses extracting a character string contained in static image data by at least one of (1) extracting text data from the static image data which has the text data, and (2) performing character recognition processing on the static image data and extracting text data which is a result of the processing (column 9 lines 64-67). A second extraction unit that extracts the keyword input by the user from at least one of meta-data and voice index data (see figure 9 column 6 lines 64-67 column 7 lines 1-10, column 10 lines 30-50) first extraction performed by the first extraction unit and a second extraction performed by the second extraction unit being instructed by the use on the same screen (column 10 lines 30-50 see also figure 9); the retrieval unit retrieving at least one of the meta data and the voice index data that include the input word (column 10 lines 30-50). The motivation to combine is to allow searching of voice data and text data (see column 10 lines 30-50) Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Chen with Merrill to reach the aforementioned advantage.

Re claim 4 Claim 4 is the method performed by the system of claim 1 and is likewise rejected

Re claim 6 claim 6 is a computer program corresponding to the method of claim 4 claim 6 is likewise rejected

Re claims 9-11 these claims depend from claims 1,4 and 6 respectively and recite, wherein the video display unit displays a time scale including a slidable plug and

the users operation for selecting at least one of the displayed relevant static image data comprises moving a slidable plug on a displayed time scale to select a slide image that is associated with the time position of the video data to be replayed which is disclosed by Chen in column 5 lines 40-50.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **SEAN MOTSINGER** whose telephone number is (571)270-1237. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on 571-272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bhavesh M Mehta/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624

Motsinger
8/27/2009